

# EDDIE'S THE LIGHT-BEARER.

ENTERED AT THE CHICAGO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER  
CENSORED BY THE POSTAL AUTHORITIES BEFORE DELIVERY TO SUBSCRIBERS.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

CHICAGO, ILL., SEPT. 28, 1895. E. M. 305 [C. E. 1905].

WHOLE NO. 1049

## THE STUDY OF THE REALITIES.

The saying that one-half the world knows not how the other half lives is very true, into whatever halves we divide the world. But people really know scarcely anything of the life even of their own half world, or of that fraction of it with which they are in contact. In truth, we do not even know ourselves. "If a man could read the story of his own life he would not believe it." We have studied human life in the same spirit as the child who loves fairy tales; and in all the many places where we cannot see facts we have placed fiction.

All the important facts of life are admittedly grouped around the two chief needs of humanity as of every animal—food and sex. Yet how very scanty is the knowledge which is made current coin among us about either of the subjects in its simplest form. We usually have to unlearn whatever was vaguely told us. The nurse tells the child to make haste over its meals, perhaps adding that it is greedy to spend much time eating; yet the best of all rules of eating is "Eat slowly." And with regard to sex, we all know that ignorance has been our motto, but too well adhered to, and we fear to face truth.

In our business, our friendships, our talk, our dress, we are bound to semblances, not realities; and in rejecting facts we are not even allowed to choose our own fictions; we are as much tied to "the style" in the color and cut of our conversation as of our clothing and all else.

The postal inquisitors have just recently given us an outstanding example of the worship of ignorance, and of the cowardice which utterly refuses to recognize facts and trace results. They laid down the rule lately that "Any and all discussion of the sex question is obscene and so uninmissible—the only occasion for any talk of such matters is in the private conversations of physicians with patients" (words officially given by Assistant Attorney-General Goodwin, law officer of the postoffice department). As the secretary of the Propaganda of Free Discussion truly remarks, "This man holds our literature and art absolutely at his mercy." And such officials, like too many of the unthinking public, are incapable of realizing the effects of making physicians the only guides of conduct in sex. Our upholding of ignorance and suppression of books that give facts instead of fancies have already brought about this result to a great extent; but no honest physicians willingly accept the situation of being made in these lines sole confessors and directors of conduct as well as healers.

And when we remember that sex questions of delicacy arise chiefly at times when the susceptibilities are most easily affected, and also that the very people who have used their influence to prevent the publication of scientific works on sex also in the past prevented and still largely hinder women from becoming physicians, it should surely be clear that the personal dignity and natural feeling of women, especially, are disregarded by their being denied all knowledge of the health side of sex except by personal interviews with one of the opposite sex. I believe every physician in ordinary family practice could testify to the truth of the trying circumstances to which I refer; and only the most thoughtless of the laity who are determined to shirk realities would deny it.

With glaring inconsistency, the postal censors allow the transmission of the Bible, and I believe Boccaccio, through the mails, and deny it to the grave, scientific reasoning of such books as Dr. Drysdale's famous work, which circulates freely in every European

country but which is forbidden in the United States. But even the quaint obscenities and unashamed improprieties of the Bible and Boccaccio are trifling disturbances of the mind compared to compelling girls, when they need reliable information, to discuss the most emotional of all subjects in conversation with a man. That painful sensitiveness and excitement of feeling often result is well known.

According to last census, 63 per cent of the people of the United States live in places of less than 4,000 population. Such places do not have qualified women doctors. Therefore the law officer of the postoffice department has decided that at least 63 per cent of the women of the United States shall either discuss with a man the health laws of sex, so important for a woman to know, or have no means of getting knowledge on the subject. How does this compare with the Roman Catholic confessional?

FIDEL DEFENSOR.

## THE FOLLY OF SETTING LIMITS TO KNOWLEDGE.

I have been told by many good people that this question or that question was quite outside of the domain of science and presumptuous in one to inquire into, writes Professor A. E. Dolbear in an article on "The Science Problems of the Twentieth Century," in the July number of the Popular Science Monthly. Astronomy and geology and chemistry are graciously permitted to be in the hands of the man of science, but life and mind phenomena are declared to be outside the province of physical science; yet the same was said about astronomy and geology and chemistry not many generations ago. Was not Newton condemned for dethroning the Almighty by proposing the law of gravitation for keeping the planets in their orbits? Was not war made upon those who undertook to show that the earth was more than 6,000 years old, and were not the chemists who showed how organic compounds could be formed believed to be enemies of truth and bent on misleading mankind? Isn't it curious to contemplate that those who know least about a given science should be the ones to set its limits?

To-day men's lives are not endangered as they used to be for their attempts to find an answer to puzzling questions, so the work goes on, and the things discovered are never like what was anticipated by the good and conservative people who know beforehand what can and what can not be known. It took more than two generations to convince the world of the truth of the nebular theory, that the earth was millions of years old, that mankind had occupied the earth for hundreds of thousands of years; and the doctrine of evolution is hardly forty years old. Perhaps one of the good things which the twentieth century will be able to accomplish will be effectually to warn everybody of the danger of setting any limits to knowledge; also that any opinion mankind has held that has not been through the crucible of science is probably wrong, but the only reason for holding this is that so far every one so tested has been found to be erroneous.

It is noteworthy, nevertheless, that the freest countries in the world have the most divorces. In countries where a woman can earn her own living she will not consent to live her whole life with an unfaithful or tyrannous husband. The growing economic independence of woman is just as great a cause of divorce as the decline of a belief in marriage as an irrevocable sacrament.—Chicago Tribune (editorial).

## LUCIFER: CHICAGO, ILL.

### EARLY CHRISTIAN THEORY OF THE UNIVERSE.

Among the very few scientific questions which occupied a considerable amount of attention in the early Church one of the most remarkable was that concerning the existence of the Antipodes. The Manicheans had chanced to stumble on the correct doctrine, and consequently the Fathers opposed it. Although, however, the leaders of the Church were apparently unanimous in denying the existence of the Antipodes, it appears that the contrary opinion had spread to a considerable extent among the less noted Christians, and some fear was entertained lest it should prove a new heresy.

About the year A. D. 535, in the reign of Justinian, there was living in a monastery of Alexandria an old monk named Cosmas, to whom the eyes of many were then turned. He had been in his youth a merchant, and in that profession had traveled much, especially in the regions of India and of Ethiopia. He was also noted for his keen and inquisitive mind and for his scientific attainments, and since he had embraced a religious life he had devoted himself zealously to the relations between Scripture and science. At the earnest request of some of the theologians of his time he determined, though now somewhat broken in health, and suffering especially, as he tells us, from "a certain dryness both of the eyes and of the stomach," to employ the remainder of his life in the composition of a great work, which was not only to refute the "Anila fable" of the Antipodes, but was to form a complete system of the universe, based upon the teaching of Revelation.

This book is called the "Topographia Christiana," or "Christian Opinion Concerning the World." (I have quoted the Benedictine Latin translation. In his preface Monfaucon has collected a long chain of passages from the Fathers denying the existence of the Antipodes.) Independently of its main interest, as probably the most elaborate work on the connection between science and the Bible which the early Church has bequeathed us, it is extremely curious on account of its many digressions concerning life and manners in the different nations. Cosmas had visited. It opens with a tone of great confidence. It is a "Christian topography of the universe, established by demonstration from Divine Scripture, concerning which it is not lawful for a Christian to doubt." In a similar strain the writer proceeds to censure with great severity those weak-minded Christians who had allowed the subtleties of Greek fables, or the deceitful glitter of mere human science, to lead them astray, forgetting that Scripture contained intimations of the nature of the universe of far higher value and authority than any to which unassisted man could attain, and seeking to frame their conceptions simply by the deductions of their reason. Such, Cosmas assures us, is not the course he would pursue. "To the law and to the testimony" was his appeal, and he doubted not that he could evolve from their pages a system far more correct than any that pagan wisdom could attain.

The system of the universe of which remarks to this effect form the prelude may be briefly stated. According to Cosmas, the world is a flat parallelogram. Its length, which should be measured from east to west, is the double of its breadth, which should be measured from north to south. In the center is the earth we inhabit, which is surrounded by the ocean, and this again is encircled by another earth, in which men lived before the Deluge, and from which Noah was transported in the ark. To the north of the world is a high conical mountain, around which the sun and moon continually revolve. When the sun is hid behind the mountain, it is night; when it is on our side of the mountain, it is day. To the edges of the outer earth the sky is glued. It consists of four high walls rising to a great height, and there meeting in a vast concave roof, thus forming an immense edifice of which our world is the floor. This edifice is divided into two stories by the firmament, which is placed between the earth and the roof of the sky. A great ocean is inserted in the side of the firmament remote from the earth. This is what is signified by the waters that are above the firmament. The space from these waters to the roof of the sky is allotted to the blest; that from the firmament to our earth to the angels, in their character of ministering spirits.

The reader will probably not regard these opinions as prodigies of scientific wisdom; but the point with which we are especially concerned is the manner they were arrived at. In order to show this, it will be necessary to give a few samples of the arguments of Cosmas.

In the account of the six days' creation, it will be remembered the whole work is summed up in a single sentence, "This is the book of the generation of the heaven and the earth." These expressions are evidently intended to comprise everything that is contained in the heaven and the earth. But, as Cosmas contended, if the doctrine of the Antipodes were correct, the sky would surround and consequently contain the earth, and therefore, it would only be said, "This is the book of the generation of the sky." This very simple argument was capable of great extension, for there was scarcely any sacred writer who had not employed the phrase, "the heaven and the earth" to include, the whole creation, and who had not thus implied that one of them did not include the other. Abraham, David, Hosea, Isaiah, Zachariah, and many others, were cited. Even Melchisedec had thus uttered his testimony against the Antipodes. If we examine the subject a little further, we are told that the earth is fixed firmly upon its foundation, from which we may at least infer that it is not suspended in the air; and we are told by St. Paul, that all men are made to live upon the "face of the earth," from which it clearly follows that they do not live upon more faces than one, or upon the back. With such a passage before his eyes, a Christian, we are told, should not "even speak of the Antipodes."

Such arguments might be considered a conclusive demonstration of the falseness of the Manichean doctrine. It remained to frame a correct theory to fill its place. The first great point of illumination that meets us in this task consists in the fact that St. Paul more than once speaks of the earth as a tabernacle. From this comparison some theologians, and Cosmas among the number, inferred that the tabernacle of Moses was an exact image of our world. This being admitted, the paths of science were greatly simplified. The tabernacle was a parallelogram twice as long from east to west as from north to south, and covered over as a room. Two remarkable passages, mistranslated in the Septuagint, in one of which Isaiah is made to compare the heavens to a vault, and in the other of which Job speaks of the sky as glued to the earth, completed the argument, and enabled the writer to state it almost with the authority of an article of faith.—Lecky's "Rationalism in Europe."

### FREEDOM IN LOVE.

The fifth commandment of love is this: Thou shalt not bind me with fetters.

The one fact that humanity is more loathe to accept than any other that love is a wilding that pines away and dies in captivity.

You can not teach it to be happy in a prison, no matter how much you gild the bars. You can not keep it from chafing at its bonds, no matter how soft and silken they are. You can not reconcile it to being held a captive, no matter if its jail is in the heart of the one that it prefers above all the world.

It must be free. It must have the sense of liberty, and this gives us a curious paradox—free love, and you bind it; bind love, and you free it. Leave the door open so that love may come and go at will, and it will not stir from your side. Lock the door, and bar every window ever so closely, and you can not make the prison so tight but what love will find a way to escape from it.

Thus it is that those who seem to hold love lightest and most carelessly really hold it most securely, while those who have fettered it and chained it in with affection, are surest of having the little elf give them the slip.

It is a matter of marvel that the so-called unconventional ties between men and women are frequently so enduring and ideal while the legitimate bonds that bind a couple together so firmly chafe and irritate to the point of madness and divorce. The reason is to be found in this world-old truth—that love must have freedom.

The law of love is the law of contraries. Nobody ever loved another because they ought to, or because it was expedient, or profitable. \* \* \*

The mistake that most men and women make is in expecting their husbands and wives to love them because it is their duty, when in all the bright lexicon of Cupid there is no such word as duty.

Love is a free will offering, and it suffers no constraint. It must be free, and only those keep it that are wise enough not to try to fetter it.—Dorothy Dix, in Chicago Evening American.

## VARIOUS VOICES.

[Reproduced from No. 1046, held up by the postal officials.]

T. M. Watson, Whitewater, Wis.—I enclose my second 25-cent piece, as promised, to help sustain you in your tribulations. I most sincerely hope all your subscribers and friends will remember to make little remittances from time to time, to encourage you in your struggles.

Gertie Vose, Home, via Lakebay, Wash.—Your latest trouble is certainly provoking much thought and heated discussions, which I believe will end in good work. Last Sunday, at our park meeting, Lois Waisbrooker read a prose-poem of her own composition, entitled "Freedom's Martyrs," which went through the audience like a thunderbolt. Tears streamed from many eyes, applause nearly shook the ground, and the deepest emotions were stirred in every breast. In such times one seems almost incapable of expressing one's indignation at the powers that ride rough-shod over the really pure and innocent ones, allowing the widest scope to degenerates—those with arrested mentalities. Wish you could spend a year at Home. We certainly have a good thing here—no angels or heaven, but just good warm comrades. Inclosed is \$1 for subscription to LUCIFER.

F. A. M. Cook, M. D., Elm Place, R. R. 3, Columbus, Kan.—I am going to christen my new mail box by renewing my subscription to LUCIFER. It is surprising to me that men and women who claim to be intelligent do not think the human race need to be instructed in the science most essential to life. Stock and plants and fruit are improved; books, essays, and lectures are the proper thing on that subject; but boys and girls are not considered worthy of any improvement. They must not be taught that they have in their make-up organs which make them grand and noble by a proper use, or destroy them physically and mentally by abuse of the same. Inclosed find \$1.50; the dollar for LUCIFER and the 50 cents for you, with the wish it was so many dollars.

Arthur Wastall, 3 Amalinda Road, East London, Cape Colony.—I thank you for letting me know what is happening. I received last week the Free Speech League's circular apprising me that trial would take place 1st June. I mailed them 30 shillings last week on behalf of two friends and myself. The one is a Frenchman here in East London, and the other an Australian lady. Both know you through me and admire your pluck and outspokenness. Lady Florence Dixie has always been a true friend of progress. She is well known in England to dietetic and anti-vivisection reformers, and used to help the Natural Food propaganda when I was conducting it. Such broad-mindedness is refreshing wherever found, but especially in aristocratic circles, where one scarcely looks for it.

J. W. Gott, Bradford, England—Your trial took place under a judge and jury who have done you a great injustice, which I hope will be righted in the higher court. I am glad to see you bear it with dignity and with the scorn such treatment deserves.

J. Allen Evans, Box 923, Cripple Creek, Colo.—I herewith enclose \$1 to pay for "Thoughts of a Fool," already received and read. I've read many books on the sex question, but never read anything equal to "Thoughts of a Fool." The author is only a fool in the eyes of a time-serving, conventional society. She is not only a brilliant, but a fine, good woman; any radical sending for her book who does not say that it is worth its weight in gold can enclose the book to me and I'll send them the dollar for it. Don't fail to read the "Thoughts of a Fool"—it's the treat of a lifetime. It would be a grand old world to live in if all women were like the authoress.

George Brown, Philadelphia, Pa.—I cannot begin to tell you how entirely satisfied I am with you and what you do. The simplicity and dignity with which you meet and pass through such trying ordeals charms me out of myself. You at least have no "murdered ideals" to mourn over. You are, I think, the only man who has impressed me as being in yourself greater than the ideals for which we both stand. I do hope there will be some way of keeping you out of prison, for you are an old man and the physical strain might be too much for you; otherwise I should not so much fear, for I know that you will bear it to the confusion of your enemies. Do you know, I envy you the many honors that are being heaped upon you by those who seek

to perpetuate ancient and hoary injustices? But I freely add mine to the many good wishes and kind thoughts that will go with you into the prison cell, should you have to go. You have the certainty that that cell should be the brightest and cheeriest place on earth could we but make it so. I send you a dollar on subscription, and will send more soon. Of course I want you to send LUCIFER, even though I am a little slow in remitting; I will pay some time.

The Anthony Comstock legislation, as interpreted by the courts and the postal department, is entitled to no more respect than the acts of Parliament which our Revolutionary forefathers defied, or the pro-slavery statutes and decisions which the friends of liberty violated and apropos of which Wendell Phillips declared, "The chief use of good laws is to teach men to trample bad laws under their feet." We are as bound to break bad laws as we are to keep good laws. Whenever human law and divine law become irreconcilable, the human law, not the divine law, should be violated. "We ought to obey God rather than men." The leaders and saviors of men have often been law-breakers. Moses, Daniel, Peter, Huss, Luther, Tell, Kossuth, Bozzaris, George Washington and John Brown were law-breakers. Thank God for the brave men and women who break bad laws for conscience sake!—Doctor Jeremiah Justice, Mount Sterling, Illinois.

Philip G. Peabody, 15 Court Square, Boston, Mass.—Like other lovers of justice, I honor you, and despise the politicians who are so insolently interfering with your and my rights, more than I can say. This outrage on you has done more to destroy my patriotism than anything that ever came into my life. I regret that I have ceased to be a good and loyal United States citizen. N. B.—The use of the word "American," to indicate a citizen of our country, is a sample of the arrogant impudence of the group of politicians at present "running" the country.—It gave me much pleasure to send to Dr. Foote, Jr., \$25 for your defense. Not seeing it credited in "Lucifer's Helpers," on page 346, I write, as requested.—You have now, as always, my best wishes. To say that you are as far above those who are persecuting you, as Jesus Christ was above the men who crucified him, would be to pay you a very small and imperfect compliment.

Mrs. R. Washington.—How can I describe my feelings as I read your letter, also those pages of LUCIFER? I will do all I possibly can in the way of getting subscribers for LUCIFER—yes, I do want the paper, and will try to pay some on my subscription. I am owing you so much on that that I am almost ashamed to ask you to send the paper longer.

I do not know what I can say to express my sympathy. How I wish the mothers would awaken enough to appreciate you! I can't keep the tears from falling as I write, and I long to do something, so I am going to write to the few liberals I know, and try to rouse them to do something. I think I can get a few subscribers in that way.

I am still working by the day, at anything I can do to support my three children, and at times feel as if I must give up the struggle. I have not a bit of help, as I never got any alimony, and my relatives are nearly all so interested in the church that they have no time to think of anything else. Being away from home all the week, I do my own washing, baking, sewing, etc., on Sunday, which displeases my good relations still more. If they happen to come in and find me at work they are dreadfully shocked and sometimes scold me. It is very unpleasant being in such surroundings, and I often wish I could put a good distance between myself and my own people.

## SUGGESTIONS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In sending in names of new subscribers please state (1) if money for same is paid by said subscriber, or (2) is paid by remitter with knowledge and consent, or (3) without knowledge or consent of new subscriber. In the latter case, we want to write and ask if the person wishes to receive paper, so by having the information at first a great deal of labor is saved.

Those who do not wish to see their letters or names in LUCIFER should write "Not for publication" on each letter; for, while the majority do not object to their letters or extracts therefrom being used, a few do; and it would entail too much unnecessary labor to write to each for permission to make such use of their words.



## THE LIGHT-BEARER.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.  
PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY AT 500 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year.....\$1.00 Three months .....25 cents  
Six months.....50 cents Single copies.....5 cents

Hereafter Lucifer will not be sent to subscribers after expiration of subscription except by special request. Please compare number on your wrapper with whole number of paper, and if your subscription is about to expire notify us if you wish to continue to receive Lucifer.

EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE:  
E. C. WALKER, 244 WEST 143D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

## LUCIFER: ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE.

LUCIFER—The planet Venus; so called from its brightness.—Webster's Dictionary.

LUCIFEROUS—Giving light; affording light or the means of discovery.—Same.

LUCIFIC—Producing light.—Same.

LUCIFORM—Having the form of light.—Same.

The name Lucifer means Light-Bringing or Light-Bearing, and the paper that has adopted this name stands for Light against Darkness—for Reason against Superstition—for Science against Tradition—for Investigation and Enlightenment against Credulity and Ignorance—for Liberty against Slavery—for Justice against Privilege.

CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITTING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, OR OF THE PRESS; OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.—First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

## TO MARRY OR NOT TO MARRY.

"Mr. Harman's cardinal doctrine is that a woman should always have the control of her own person. He also believes in the abolition of legal marriage. With the first of these ideas we fully agree; with the second we differ *in toto*."

Thus speaks Alice Stone Blackwell in her very excellent editorial, entitled "The Postoffice and Free Speech," in "Woman's Journal," Boston, Aug. 12, 1905.

When on trial in the Federal District Court in this city in June last, Mr. Marston, Assistant District Attorney, who made the chief speech for the prosecution, asked the question with much emphasis and incisiveness of manner:

"Mr. Harman, are you not on record as an opponent of marriage?"

I was not allowed to answer the question, but that this implied indictment had much to do with securing the jury verdict of "guilty," there is much reason to believe, just as there is good reason for believing that my alleged opposition to the marriage institution had much to do with securing, in the Kansas Federal Court, 15 years ago, the sentence of five years' imprisonment and a fine of three hundred dollars. When delivering this sentence Judge Foster laid particular emphasis upon this point—that my paper was the enemy of marriage and, therefore, its editor and publisher deserved exemplary punishment.

The same charge is constantly made against me by leading Freethinkers, Agnostics, Infidels, Socialists, etc., many of whom have joined hands with orthodox Christians in their effort to bring LUCIFER and its editor under the ban of popular condemnation and of legal prosecution.

For these reasons I think it well to say a few words in self-defense, to show the real head and front of my offending in this regard.

While sincerely thanking Miss Blackwell for the two brave and strong editorials in defense of freedom of speech and of press, and for her kindly references to LUCIFER and its work. I would say that she seems not fully and truly to understand my attitude, and that of LUCIFER's leading workers on the marriage question. Speaking for myself alone I would say that I oppose "legal marriage" for the same reason and to the same extent that I oppose legal enforcement of religious creeds, religious rites and ceremonies, or legal enforcement of attendance upon church services,

observance of holy days, or legally enforced payment of taxes for the support of church creeds, salaries of the clergy, and all legal privileges granted to churches, that are denied to societies or organizations that do not claim to be religious.

I oppose the conventional marriage system, the popular, the indissoluble, the sacramental marriage system, not because I would deprive any man or woman of their citizen right to be married *in their own way*, but because I believe the promises made "at the altar" to be *immoral* promises, that they enslave and degrade the parties, especially the woman, when taking upon themselves vows of lifelong fidelity. I oppose conventional marriage because I believe that such vows and their fulfillment often result in lifelong misery to those who make them, and especially because I believe that fidelity to these vows on the physical plane—when love does not sanction their fulfillment, is one of the chief causes of race-degeneracy, and consequently the cause of the evils that grow out of race-degeneracy, including bad laws, political, economic, social; also including bad administration of otherwise good laws—all because of the well known principle that laws, institutions and their administration *can be no better than the people themselves who make these laws and institutions, or (what is the same thing) who passively endure laws and their administration when saddled upon them by ambitious leaders of the present or of past generations.*

This, in general terms, is why I oppose the popular marriage system, but I propose no violent revolution to secure the abolition of marriage laws, any more than I would propose a violent revolution to secure the abolition of the laws that now grant special privileges to churches and to churchmen. I appeal not to the arm of force, but simply to the common sense, and the sense of justice, of right and of fairness, that we all assume to lie at the bottom of human laws and government.

To put it a little differently, I believe in and advocate *freedom of marriage, freedom of love*, which is the only true basis of marriage, just as I believe in and advocate freedom in religious beliefs and religious observances, freedom of worship—the right to believe in one god, in three gods or a hundred gods, and the right to worship these gods in any way the devotee prefers, so long as that devotee does not try to force his belief and worship upon those of a different belief, or of no religious belief at all.

If I oppose "legal marriage," as Miss Blackwell says I do, it is chiefly because legal marriage opposes woman's right to self-ownership.

I oppose it because self-ownership and legal marriage are radically, irreconcilably opposed to each other.

One or the other must yield.

Which shall it be?

Self-ownership for woman is irrevocably bound up with her right to choose and to refuse her conjugal companionship, not once only and for life, but at all times just as she should have the right to choose at all times in matters of food, of drink and of clothing, or of business partnerships.

Once more for this time. If I read aright the book that Christians call the inspired volume, compulsory marriage laws are no part of the Christian code as first laid down. The greatest authority on Christian ethics, Saul of Tarsus, called also Paul, or Saint Paul, is quoted as saying:

"He that giveth in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth not in marriage doeth better." 1 Corinthians, 38th verse. Also: "I would that all men were even as I myself." That is, unmarried. Also: "I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I." Seventh and 8th verses of same chapter.

Much to the same effect is the teaching and the example of him who is regarded the chief hero of the Christian religion. The inferences to be drawn from these teachings and examples are obvious enough, and, therefore, I prefer not to take time and space to elaborate the matter further at this time. M. H.

Tendency to disease and tendency to vice are of similar origin, and neither can be cured by punishment, vengeance or imprisonment; but all tendency to disease, peculiarities, fears, weaknesses and vices in young or old can be cured or modified by favorable environment, suggestive therapeutics, massage and physical culture.—*Medical Brief*.

It is a matter of commonest observation that conventional marriage is hostile to friendship of every kind.—Dora Forster.

## SWEET LAND OF LIBERTY.

In No. 1,046 Louis F. Post is quoted as saying: "Though a great influx of foreigners in recent years—foreigners seeking not greater liberty as in earlier times, but only better wages—may have had the effect of making American landmarks of liberty fade in the public opinion of today," etc. Although I greatly admire Mr. Post's article as a whole, yet I think that on this point he is altogether in error. If there has been a decline in American liberty, I do not believe foreigners are to blame for it.

When John Turner was deported I read an article in one of the New York dailies describing a public meeting held in his favor. It was stated that the meeting consisted chiefly of foreigners from the East Side, and the paper remarked that foreigners were now the only persons in the United States who cared anything for the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

Let us compare the United States and Europe as regards the freedom of the press to discuss the sex question. There is a well-known book, written by an English physician, which could not be named in LUCIFER. It advocates free love for unmarried women, denounces celibacy in unmeasured terms, and explains in full detail how to prevent conception. No American bookseller would attempt to advertise or mail it. This book has been translated into nearly every European language, and circulates with complete freedom in every European country. In France it is now going through the 6th edition, translated from the 32d English edition. My copy is in German and belongs to the 12th German edition. I bought it in 1890 in one of the largest book stores on the main street of Munich, my attention having been drawn to it by the prominent place it occupied in the window. At the beginning of the book are extracts from the press notices of it by the leading German newspapers, some of which I shall quote.

The "Neue Freie Presse" of Vienna is by universal admission the principal newspaper of Austria. It says of the book: "The father of a family who needs a reliable adviser regarding the bodily and mental health of his children, will be no less grateful to the unknown author of this work than will the student who wishes good instruction about the nature of society, and its moral and sanitary relations."

Many consider the "Frankfurter Zeitung" the best paper in Germany: It says: "Its standpoint will certainly shock, if not terrify, many unthinking persons, but it will be impossible to oppose it with arguments."

The "Berliner Tageblatt" is as prominent in Berlin as the "Tribune" in New York, or the "Inter-Ocean" in Chicago. It says of the book: "It deserves, indeed, the attention not only of all physicians, natural scientists and philosophers, but also of all men who have at heart the progress of human society."

There are flattering notices from seventeen other daily newspapers and scientific journals, all capitalist and orthodox like those I have quoted. Yet the book which these German papers extol cannot be named in print in the United States.

I take a French paper, edited by a well-known public man. It is devoted to the limitation of the family and contains matter which would quickly land any American editor in jail. The last issue I got was accompanied by a price list of eighteen different preventives. I need hardly say that I cannot give the name of the paper.

I have no personal knowledge of Russia, but am told that there is unlimited freedom of the press so far as the sex question is concerned.

To cut a long story short, it may safely be said that in every part of Continental Europe there is freedom to discuss this question. As much cannot be said of Great Britain, for now and again there have been Puritanical outbreaks there in the last thirty years. In 1877 Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant were prosecuted for circulating a book about preventives, and, although the Lord Chief Justice, who presided at the trial, recommended their acquittal, the jury found them guilty. Next year, however, a higher court quashed the conviction on a technicality, and Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant recommenced selling the book. The police told them that there would be no further interference, and since then there has been unlimited freedom of the press in England so far as preventives are concerned. The largest business in preventives is done from a country postoffice, and the postal authorities must know perfectly well that almost the whole business of that office is of that character. Yet, nothing is said.

During the past twenty-seven years there have been in Eng-

land only three abuses of the obscenity law that have attracted general attention, although it is quite likely that there have been a number in the smaller towns which have been little noticed. In 1889 Vizitelly was imprisoned for a year for publishing some of Zola's novels. These do not discuss the sex question, but were supposed to contain indecent descriptions (one of Zola's novels is, or was, prohibited even in Germany). In 1898 George Bedborough was prosecuted for selling a book discussing love relations between persons of the same sex, and some articles in a magazine were afterwards included in the indictment. He plead guilty, and was allowed to go without punishment. About the same time a warrant was issued against Dr. Villiers for publishing another sex paper, but he escaped to the continent. Those were serious outrages, but far more have occurred in the United States within the same period. It must also be said that there is nothing in England like the administrative process of the United States post-office.

Let me also remind Mr. Post that when outrages on liberty are committed in Europe, popular resistance is much more energetic than in the United States. Lillian Harman was in England during the Bedborough prosecution, and was deeply impressed by the organization and activity of the defenders of a free press. An American would be still more surprised at the vigor of the German Socialists, the Spanish Anarchists, or the Russian Revolutionists.

Finally, look at the names of the persecutors—Comstock, Hitchcock, McAfee, Madden, Hull, Goodwin. There is nothing foreign about these names. Except Goodwin, they are not even modern English; they are strictly American. I have a strong suspicion that the forefathers of every one of the persecutors were in America in the golden days of Hawthorne's "Scarlet Letter" and the Blue Laws of Connecticut.

From the above facts it does not seem to me likely that foreigners are much to blame for the postal censorship of the United States.

R. B. KERR.

## LUCIFER'S HELPERS.

C. N. and Emma Greene, 50c; Anna Wise, 50c; (Mrs.) B. M., \$4; (Mrs.) Bertha Moore, 20c; (Mrs.) H. J. K., 75c; E. M. Bullock, \$1; M. G. D., \$1; (Mrs.) M. E., \$2; T. M. Watson, 34c; (Mrs.) R. B. Bruce, \$1; David A. Modell, \$1; G. G. McMillan, 10c; Channing Severance, \$1; Louis Fehlberg, \$1; (Mrs.) Susan Reicherler, \$1.25; Fred P. Young, \$1; M. L. Studebaker, 50c; O. A. Verity, \$1; W. G. Scott, 20c; (Mrs.) S. T. D. Robinson, \$10; (Mrs.) S. S. Rockhill, \$1; C. E. Courson, \$5; R. B. Kerr, \$4.

In this list are included the names of those who send money or stamps to pay for LUCIFER, or its pamphlets, to be sent to friends who are not now subscribers; also the names of those who contribute to the fund for legal defense in the courts, and to keep LUCIFER's flag afloat while prosecuted for alleged "obscenity." If any names have been omitted that should have been included in this list, or, if included, incorrectly credited, the error will be gladly corrected when our attention is called thereto.

## THE PEOPLE ARE NOT THE GOVERNMENT.

[Reproduced from No. 1046, held up by the postal officials.]

The ordinary citizen cannot take advantage of the cheaper market because the blessed tariff raises the prices on all such goods when they are brought home. The government, however, does not have to pay duties on its purchases abroad and may buy in the cheapest market. It is the misfortune of the people that, although they make the government, they are not the government, and must pay American taxes on American goods.—Boston Herald.

And just so, also, in the matter of literature, pictures, etc. The people make the government, pay all the government expenses, but they must not write, read nor send through the mails that which they think good for young and old to know. The privilege to do this is reserved for the government officials, and for their favorites—presumably for the class or classes supposed to be able to control the most votes on election day. M. H.

The vice of our theology is seen in the claim that the Bible is a closed book; that the age of inspiration is past; and that Jesus was something different from a man.—Emerson.

So long as we love, we serve. So long as we are loved by others I would almost say we are indispensable; and no man is useless while he has a friend.—Robert Louis Stevenson.

## THE POSTOFFICE VS. FREE SPEECH.

Still another number of *LUCIFER* has been declared unmailable by the postoffice, and for a reason still more extraordinary than in the former cases to which we have called attention. The editor of *LUCIFER* had copied into his paper one of the *Woman's Journal's* recent editorials, in which we blamed the postal officials for suppressing an issue of *LUCIFER* because it quoted an extract from a medical book by a well-known woman physician—a book that is circulated through the mails without objection, and has been so circulated for years.

Superintendent Hull, of the Chicago postoffice, in notifying Mr. Harman that this later issue of his paper also was unmailable, marked four passages in it which were specified as obscene. Three of them were passages in the editorial copied from the *Woman's Journal*. Our readers have seen all that appeared in our columns in regard to this controversy. They can judge for themselves whether our comments on it were such as any man of sanity and good sense could declare to come under the law against circulating indecent literature.

The fourth passage pronounced unmailable by Superintendent Hull is a quotation from a report issued by the United States government through its Department of Agriculture, relating to the health of horses. In it the same advice is given in regard to the hygiene of brood mares that the woman physician gave in regard to the hygiene of prospective mothers.

The Free Speech League has issued another statement to the public. It says:

"Since our first appeal was printed repression has proceeded apace. The Washington authorities in immediate charge have continued to do injustice, while those really responsible are silent—therefore acquiescent. Assistant Attorney-General R. P. Goodwin, law officer of the Postoffice Department, who interprets the statutes for his chiefs, said to Dr. Immanuel Pfeiffer, agent of the league, 'Any and all discussions of the sex question is obscene, and so unmailable. The only occasion for any talk of such matters is in the private conversation of physicians with patients.'"

This amazing assertion is made in the face of the fact that the sex question is discussed in many scientific books that are freely circulated; it is discussed in scores of articles in the magazines; it is discussed in the medical journals, in ecclesiastical conventions, in the social purity societies and their organs, in the religious press and in problem plays and problem novels, often of very questionable taste. The matters that Mr. Goodwin says must not be talked about except in private conversation between physician and patient are spread broadcast before children and young persons in offensive quack-medicine advertisements in hundreds of daily papers; and the postoffice does not interfere.

If the postoffice officials really propose to take the ground that "any and all discussion of the sex question is obscene," they ought to make a general crusade against every one who discusses it. But they do not attack the strong publishing firms that print the problem novels and plays; they do not attack the great dailies, that publish the objectionable advertisements. They do not try to suppress the *Woman's Journal*, which has Mrs. Julia Ward Howe for chairman of its board of directors and many well-known and influential persons among its readers and supporters. But they direct a veritable persecution against little *LUCIFER* and suppress three issues of it in the course of two months, for articles which are not obscene in any honest or ordinary sense of the word. They do it because Lucifer advocates unpopular views and has few influential friends, and they hope to be able with impunity to deprive it of its constitutional right to free speech. Otherwise how does it happen that an editorial which was allowed to be published in the *Woman's Journal* without protest from the postoffice is pronounced indecent and unmailable as soon as it is copied into *LUCIFER*?

The United States Supreme Court would not for a moment sustain the monstrous proposition that "any and all discussion of the sex question is obscene, and so unmailable." It has habitually been held that that question may be discussed, provided it is done with due regard for propriety of language. The effort now is to stretch the law so as to suppress heresy on the plea of indecency. The *Woman's Journal* is wholly out of sympathy with many of the doctrines advocated in Lucifer, but we believe firmly in the right of free discussion. Truth has nothing to fear from it.

General Grant said that the best way to repeal a bad law was to enforce it, and some one else has said that it is a good thing

to have an unsound hobby ridden hard, because it is the sooner ridden to death. It is fortunate that some of our postal officials are now so flagrantly abusing their powers under the law, because this will help to get the law amended in a way to make similar abuse of it impossible in the future. Meanwhile the attention of the postmaster-general at Washington should be called to the fact that some of his subordinates are stretching the law to a preposterous degree, and are showing marked unfairness by suppressing in one paper matter that is allowed to circulate freely in other publications.

Mr. Harman, the editor of *LUCIFER*, now 74 years of age, has been sentenced to a year in the penitentiary for circulating literature said to be indecent. He has taken an appeal to a higher court and has meantime been released on bail. Any one wishing to contribute toward the cost of carrying the case to a higher tribunal can send the money to the treasurer of the Free Speech League, Dr. E. B. Foote, 120 Lexington avenue, New York City.—A. S. B., in the *Woman's Journal*.

## THE POSTAL INQUISITION AND DR. STOCKHAM.

[Reproduced from No. 1042, the double number, confiscated and destroyed by the postal officials.]

Judge Bethea's conviction of the veteran woman reformer, Dr. Alice B. Stockham, on a charge of circulating improper literature through the United States mails will bring surprise and dismay to thousands of pure-minded American women who have written letters of thanks to that reputable physician for the valuable information given in the several books which she has written on marriage and motherhood.

It is safe to say that not one woman in a thousand who has read those books ever entertained the suspicion that they contained any improper word, phrase or sentence. They are written in delicate and chaste language, full of motherly sympathy for the countless women whose marital misery has been due in great measure to their ignorance of women's natural functions.

Dr. Stockham's books are devoted almost exclusively to the science of eugenics. The word eugenics is of Greek origin, and literally means good birth. The object of Dr. Stockham's books is to instruct women in the mysteries of motherhood, so that they may bear children well equipped physically and mentally, with little or no ill effect on the mothers. She has won the lasting gratitude of thousands of women because of her success in removing to a great degree the scriptural curse of maternity.

President Roosevelt is no more opposed to race suicide than is Dr. Stockham, but this physician, who has made a study of maternity for a period as long as the entire life of President Roosevelt, believes race suicide can best be prevented and race improvement best be promoted by the production of better children rather than more numerous children.

## INTENT OF THE LAW.

"The old-fashioned father and mother believed literature on marriage and allied subjects was not for children," Judge Bethea is reported to have said in his ruling. "The young were told not to touch such subjects, just as they were told not to steal or lie. That is how the government came to have laws regulating the transmission of certain matter through the mails."

It seems to me that this is a remarkable misconception of the intent of the law, which was framed to prohibit the circulation of literature which has a tendency to deprave the morals and corrupt the minds of the young, and not in any degree to prevent the giving of scientific instruction to the mature on the most vital and most important of all sciences to the human race, namely: The science of eugenics, the science of race improvement.

Surely no congressman who voted for the passage of the often misused Comstock law had the most remote idea that he was voting to prohibit his wife or marriageable daughter from receiving advice through the mail from a reputable physician regarding prenatal culture, or the preparation for motherhood.

But, even supposing Judge Bethea is right in his contention that the original intent of the law was to prohibit the giving of such instructions—a supposition which attributes to the legislators a spirit of prudishness that few persons will admit they possessed—the law as framed surely does not forbid the giving of such instruction. It merely forbids the transmission of "obscene or indecent" literature. It requires a great stretch of the imagination to stamp as "obscene or indecent" the chaste and im-

portant information which has been given to the women of America in Dr. Stockham's book.

## ATTITUDE TAKEN BY BETHEA.

"What we have to do," says Judge Bethea, "is to uphold the law as it stands."

He is right in that assertion, but how he could convince himself that Dr. Stockham's books violated that law will be hard for the many thousands of persons who have read them to understand.

"If these persons believe they are right in teaching these subjects so that the young may learn them they should have their doctrines interwoven with the law of the land," says Judge Bethea.

A remarkable statement! The highest law of the land is generally supposed to be the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees to the people the right of freedom of press and of speech. It is not necessary to have the rights of the people "interwoven with the law"; it is sufficient that they are not forbidden by the law. The admirers of the work of Dr. Stockham have no desire to promote the circulation of literature forbidden by the law; but they contend that it is misconstruction of the law to hold that the instruction imparted in her books is in any way "obscene or indecent."

The learned judge gratuitously injects into his comment the phrase "so that the young may learn them." It is highly improbable that the young would be interested enough in Dr. Stockham's books to read them. Such an objection might be applied to the Bible or to many medical books which a child might read.

## ARE UPHELD DESPITE RULING.

"I believe Mrs. Stockham had no intention of violating the law," continued Judge Bethea, in announcing the conviction of her business manager, Dr. Edward B. Beckwith, "but this man, a Harvard graduate and a physician, 35 years old, has been in this business for six years. He should have known better."

The inference is that Dr. Beckwith had the intention to violate the law, an intention which I am sure Dr. Beckwith would indignantly deny. "He should have known better." Better than what? Better than Dr. Stockham, who has given more than forty years of her life to the instruction of women in the functions of motherhood—better than she what is pure and what is impure, what is proper and what is improper for every woman to know?

Those who know Dr. Beckwith, including many clergymen and estimable women in Chicago, assert that he is a man of the highest moral character, thoroughly conscientious, who gave up the prospect of acquiring a lucrative practice as a physician in order to devote himself to what he regarded as a more important work for the benefit of humanity, the freedom of women from the ills due to their ignorance of their physiological natures.

There are at times loud calls for the repeal of the Comstock law concerning the use of the mails, but this cry would never be heard if the law was not so frequently misused for the persecution of those who seek to benefit humanity by imparting wholesome instruction. The law is too sweeping because it does not make clear what "improper" literature is, but it is strange that a federal judge in this enlightened twentieth century could be found who would place such books as Dr. Stockham's under the ban of that law.—Jonathan Mayo Crane, in "Chicago Record-Herald," Sunday, June 11, '05.

## DIVORCE A BLESSING.

New York, June 5.—In a sermon at the Church of the Messiah, Rev. Minot J. Savage has expressed the belief that, on the whole, divorces at the present time are altogether to be welcomed.

"They are," he said, "nearly always in the interest of oppressed women, giving them another opportunity for a free, sweet, wholesome life. There are cases where the divorce laws are abused, but not nearly so many as the ministers of a great many of our churches seem to imagine."

"Law does not make marriages. The church does not make marriages. Men and women, if they are ever married, marry themselves. All the law can do is to make a clumsy attempt to protect; all the church can do is to recognize and try to consecrate a fact which already exists. But if there is no marriage, then it is desecration to keep up the sham."

Promises are bad at any time, and when the heart is full silence befits it best.—Carpenter.

## VARIOUS VOICES.

Full name and address of writers in this department can generally be obtained on application to the editor.

We are always glad to receive calls from friends visiting the city. Take the Lake street elevated, stop at Ashland avenue, walk one block east, then one block north. Or take Fulton street electric car west and stop at St. John's place, alighting in front of our house. The Lake street electric and Paulina street cars also pass within a block of our residence.

Sara T. D. Robinson, Lawrence, Kan.—Am sorry to hear of your continued persecution. I wish I could drive off the foe, but he is always close at hand. I send you the enclosed (\$10) hoping it will help you some.

Sarah Stone Rockhill, Alliance, Ohio.—You ask how I like "The Right to Be Born Well." I think it perhaps the best of all your booklets, and think it will do much good. I will send one dollar with this for the defense fund.

C. E. Coursen, Simpson, Kan.—Find enclosed my mite to help you a little. It is a late contribution but I trust it will be better than never. I wish you would send me a copy of the English Truthseeker. Also a copy of Florence Dixie's talk about what Roosevelt said at some woman's convention.

R. B. Kerr, Box 98, Oakland, Calif.—I enclose an article and \$5. Apply \$1 to LUCIFER's subscription for one year, a proper amount to have Bradford "Truthseeker" sent to me for a year, and rest to defense fund. I am glad to see that a really vigorous defense is being made this time, and that the whole country seems on the eve of wakening up over the free press question.

R. W. Phenix, B. C.—I subscribe to the Blessed Trinity, Free Thought, Free Love and Free Labor, and am not ashamed to confess the faith that is in me. Am sending you \$1.10 for a year's subscription to LUCIFER and the Bradford (Eng.) Truthseeker, in accord with your offer. Have seen an occasional copy of LUCIFER and like it well. Am sorry you are persecuted, but the world has always stoned the prophets and always will, I suppose. Have you any copies of "The Flaming Meteor," by Will Hubbard Kernan? [The Flaming Meteor is out of print, so far as we know. If any of our readers have copies to sell, please state price.]

Joseph S. Shatzke, Denver, Colorado.—I see you were sentenced to one year imprisonment, hard labor, for the expression which you think in your mind is right and just. I also noticed that they have confiscated the last issue of your paper. It is true I do not agree with you in all your views, because I believe the women cannot be free as long as the men are slaves. We must be free economically first, then we shall surely be free sexually. We must see to take away the means of life from the exploiting class, but I do believe in free expression. I believe every man and woman should have a right to express his or her ideas, and if another man thinks in his ideas it is obscene, the only way that he can do is not to read or listen to a man's expression. I believe humanity could only be elevated by free discussion. Now we must see to find a proper way how to have free expression and free press. First, I believe we must use the same means as the oppressors of suffering humanity use. If your articles are obscene I believe there are many chapters in Shakespeare and in the Bible that have the same expressions as your so-called obscene literature has.

Channing Severance, Los Angeles, Cal.—The manner in which you are hounded by the Comstock outfit is meanly contemptible, and I often wonder if they will never be sated with persecution and let you alone. The absurd charge of obscenity, of course, is not the basis of their enmity. It lies in the ideas you advocate and not the language you use, for no one can assert, with sense or reason, that a calm and rational discussion of sex questions and matters is obscene. Obscene language is low and coarse reference to the so-called private sections of the physical form, and such language was never used, to my knowledge, by any sex-reform writer. You can hear it among low and depraved people and in certain classes of society, quite often, but no man or woman who is working for the betterment of mankind along the lines you have worked these many years has any use for obscene words or expressions, and those they do use are always chaste and proper. Anyone but a senseless fanatic knows the difference between

coarse reference to sexual matters and an effort to enlighten the world as to a proper use of the sex organs and the evils that attend their improper use; also the difference between lascivious thoughts and scientific discussion of procreation, but this Comstock clique, with puritanical ideas of love and marriage, with religious insanity to insure prejudice in large quantities, seems unwilling to admit or incapable of seeing any difference between the two. \* \* \* The man who asserts that every child has a right to be well born, and who declares there is a way by which they can be, is looked upon with holy horror, and an unjust and surreptitious law, enacted by a drunken Congress, is resorted to to suppress him and prevent the priceless privilege of a free press and free mails. It seems almost incredible, with the progress the world has made in the last fifty years, that honest men and women, with high ideals and sincere desire to better conditions under which we are born and must exist, are denied that right and are fined and imprisoned, as in Mrs. Stockham's case and yours.

New York World—Anthony Comstock and his methods of reform received yesterday a rude shock in Newark, N. J., when Charles B. Smith, of Bloomfield, who was arrested by the vice crusader, charged with misusing the mails, was discharged by United States Commissioner Bigelow.

Smith was arrested after he replied to a communication from Comstock. This proved a most important point in the trial of Smith. Comstock, under a fictitious name, sent a letter to the defendant concerning the drawing for an automobile and asking for tickets.

Commissioner Bigelow decided that the writing of a letter to a person who did not exist did not bring the accused within the penalties of the law. He said the offense in this case was not voluntary, but was brought about by the solicitation of the accuser.

"The means in this case," said the Commissioner, "which were adopted by the complainant were clearly unlawful, and there is absolutely no evidence of intent on the defendant's part to violate the law, excepting as created by the complainant's letter."

DR. A. C. A., Washington, D. C.—I received your "Right to Be Born Well" and your offer to send six copies of same for one dollar. I do as much good, or more, loaning my copy, but enclose you a dollar and let you send me more pamphlets, many or few, as you please. I give away all copies of LUCIFER and talk fervently the injustice done to you. I treat forty to fifty patients a day, and if you do not get new subscribers it is not my fault. If you could send me back numbers of the magazine, I could distribute them and make my plea that much more forcible. . . . I suffered through an unhappy marriage—through ignorance of sex questions—and am most emphatic in teaching those coming in contact with me. I have an eighteen-year-old daughter who is a living example of what truthfulness about this momentous question will do. She is a happy, satisfied, normal girl. I was a studious old woman when I was twelve. I was bound to know, and my mother evaded the question. I got my knowledge from books intended for adults. My daughter got it naturally in the guise of a beautiful story. I was married when I was sixteen, a matter of curiosity; she has not the slightest desire—she knows. I was brought up "modestly"; she was brought up in the knowledge of natural law. There was nothing to cover up, nothing to be ashamed of. I am happy in having a pure, contented daughter. . . .

My mother thanks me for having escaped worse than an unhappy marriage. . . . My case is one of many. Ignorance is sin and unhappiness. Truth only is normal. . . . Am glad to count Dr. Emanuel Pfeiffer among my friends. He has done all for you here that could be done. He inspired me with the desire to help you and the cause. . . . I enclose another dollar on subscription for the address below.

H. HANSEN, Colorado City, Colo.—Some years ago an editor in New York said, "When we get the most corrupt element of society in office, then government will cease." Another said, "No self-respecting person can afford to have his name connected with a political office." I am of the opinion that both of these statements are not far from the truth. One can pick up any kind of a newspaper and it contains one or more scandals, covering all sorts and sizes of stealing and bootlegging on the part of government officers from president down to dogpelt. United States senators and congressmen and post officials are no exceptions, so it is no wonder that

1049

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your Lucifer, your subscription expires with this number. If a copy of Lucifer fails to reach you, please order by number or date.

those high-toned custodians of our morals should fear "The Light-Bearer." . . . The superintendent of our morals told the truth when he said that if the teaching of LUCIFER should be generally accepted society would be in a state of chaos. To him no doubt the politicians and priests mean society, and if LUCIFER's ideas should prevail, then indeed those gentlemen might have to do something useful for a living. . . . I was once present in a Cripple Creek court house when in less than half a day six divorce cases were gone through with. There were six judge fees, twelve lawyer fees to be paid, and if the teachings of LUCIFER were generally recognized the lawyers and judge might have gone hungry that day. Such scenes are numerous throughout the country and people are silly enough to believe that it is necessary to parade their marital misfortunes before the world, and the real reason why LUCIFER is being persecuted is because it would cut off the income of those that profit by the misfortunes of others. . . . And, again, suppose that the idea of The Light-Bearer should prevail and children should be born well, what would become of the criminal lawyers? Their occupation would be gone. . . . To say that the paper is obscene is to talk nonsense. If there is any obscenity about it it must be in the mind of the reader; it can be nowhere else.

#### BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

#### THOUGHTS OF A FOOL,

A book which deals with all the questions of the day: Sex, Popular Morality, "Success," "The Man to Be," "Life's Message," "Symbols and Tags," "The Universal Secret," etc., etc., in a manner boldly original.

ONE HUNDRED OF OUR SUBSCRIBERS can have a chance to read a copy, for the publishers have offered 100 copies to OUR SUBSCRIBERS at the SPECIAL RATE OF \$1.00.

(IT'S A \$1.50 BOOK.)

It's been widely read, much reviewed and has created a storm of criticism and praise.

Don't send for it, if you don't want strong stuff, original thought, bold views that may shock your prejudices.

Don't send for it if you have prejudices!

AND THERE ARE ONLY 100 COPIES ANYWAY AT THIS PRICE, \$1.00.

We'll return your money if the 100 are sold when it reaches us.

THE PIONEER ORGAN OF ANARCHISM.

#### LIBERTY.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR.

An Anarchistic Journal, expounding the doctrine that in Equal Liberty is to be found the most satisfactory solution of social questions, and that majority rule, or democracy, equally with monarchy rule, is a denial of Equal Liberty.

Subscription rates: 24 issues, \$1; 12 issues, 60c; single copies, 5c. Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, P. O. Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

A STUFFED CLUB. A monthly periodical teaching Health of Body and Mind by knocking the stuffing out of religious and medical superstition. For those who can think and are not afraid to think. It is the Club's intention to be constructive as well as destructive. \$1 a year, 10c a month. Address A STUFFED CLUB, Denver, Colo.

THE TRUTH SEEKER. Monthly. Edited by J. W. Goff, Bradford. The last man in England prosecuted for Blasphemy. This paper creates a sensation wherever it goes. One shilling six pence per annum, post free; single copies, 5c. American agency: Lucifer, 54 Fulton st., Chicago.

#### BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

OTTO WETTSTEIN,

THE LIBERAL MAIL-ORDER JEWELER.

Now permanent at No. 110 N. Kensington av., La Grange, Cook Co., Ill. Can save you 10 to 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line. Write me and receive prices and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

J. H. GREER, M. D.,  
3 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO.

Office Hours—9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m. Telephone Randolph 41.

DR. OGILVIE A. RICE,  
DENTIST.  
1556 MILWAUKEE AVE., COR. WESTERN, CHICAGO.  
Telephone West 141.

PHILIP G. PEABODY,  
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61,  
BOSTON, MASS.